

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3 and 5-13 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

#### **Amendment to the Specification**

The Specification has been amended to include a list of Acronyms. The acronyms already were present in the Specification. It is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand the acronyms, but for convenience of the reader, a list has now been included. No new matter is added.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,302,497 of Vilander et al. ("Vilander"). Applicants respectfully submit that switch 40 as taught by Vilander is not an ATM interface module as recited in the claimed invention. Vilander discloses that switch 40 is included in a RNC. In contrast, the present claimed invention recites that an ATM interface module is included in the RNC.

Vilander describes two examples of switch 40. In the first example, switch 40 is the one in figure 2 of RNC 24. According to Vilander, col. 8, line 5, switch 40 is an ATM switch which is controlled by a RNC control unit 41. The RNC control unit 41 is connected to each element of RNC 24 (see Vilander, col. 7, lines 35-38). It is respectfully submitted that because the switch 40 described by Vilander is an ATM switch, it is not equal to an ATM interface module that can

perform ATM/IP conversion, as recited in the claimed invention. In the second example, instead of a switch 40, Vilander describes that the various boards or units of the RNC could each have a router, so that the IP router on each board would essentially map an IP address to an ATM VCI (see Vilander, col. 8, lines 5-7). In the second example, because switch 40 is replaced with IP routers, Vilander teaches away from providing a switch included in the RNC 24. Therefore, Vilander fails to disclose, or suggest, an ATM interface module that can perform ATM/IP conversion as recited in the claimed invention. Additionally, Vilander neither discloses, nor suggests, an IP switching network for achieving data and signaling exchange among the functional modules is included in the RNC.

Amended claim 1 now recites that the ATM interface module has at least an Iu interface module, an Iub interface module and an Iur interface module, each respective interface module being configured to convert a received ATM cell to an Internet Protocol (IP) packet. In contrast, Vilander, col. 7, lines 35-36 and 40 and figure 2, merely describes a RNC control unit 41 that is connected to each element of RNC 24, where RNC control unit 41 controls switch 40.

Additionally, Vilander, col. 8, lines 5- , merely describe that switch 40 is typically an ATM switch. However, Vilander does not expressly disclose or suggest that when RNC control unit 41 controls switch 40, data and signaling exchange is performed in IP protocol. Similarly, Vilander does not expressly disclose or suggest that data and signaling exchange between RNC control unit 41 and other elements in RNC 24 is performed in IP protocol. Vilander does not disclose the content that an IP switching network for achieving data and signaling exchange among the functional modules is included in the RNC.

Thus, Vilander does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Vilander cannot anticipate claim 1, nor dependent claims 2-7.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Vilander is respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vilander in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,046,999 of Miki et al. (“Miki”). Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vilander in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0109455 of Jouppi et al. (“Jouppi”).

Dependent claims 8-13 depend from independent claim 1, and include the features of claim 1 as if set forth therein. Claims 8-13 are patentable over respective combinations of Vilander, Miki, and Jouppi, to the extent proper, at least of the same reasons discussed above. Therefore, a respective combination of Vilander, Miki, and Jouppi, to the extent proper, does not render dependent claims 8-13 obvious.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the respective rejections of claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on respective combinations of Vilander, Miki, and Jouppi is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing it is believed that remaining claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any unpaid fees deemed required in connection with this submission, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 04-0100.

Dated: June 3, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Richard J. Katz

Registration No.: 47,698  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 770  
Church Street Station  
New York, New York 10008-0770  
(212) 527-7700  
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)  
Attorney For Applicant